DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 157 314 EC 111 799

AUTHOR Haughton, Donna Denney
TITLE Mediating into the Mainstream.
PUB DATE Jun 78
NOTE 24p.; Paper presented at the World Congress on Future Special Education (First, Stirling, Scotland, June 25 - July 1, 1978)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Demonstration Projects; Elementary Secondary Education; *Handicapped Children; Higher Education; *Inservice Teacher Education; *Mainstreaming; *Performance Based Teacher Education; Post Secondary Education; Program Descriptions; Program Development; Teachers
IDENTIFIERS Project PREM

ABSTRACT

The paper describes Project PREM (Preparing Regular Educators for Mainstreaming), a program to develop a training model and materials to prepare regular educational personnel to work with mildly handicapped students, to expand the implementation of the training model, and to disseminate the revised materials within the University of Texas at Austin sphere of influence. Background information is provided on the implementation of legislation which encourages the placement of handicapped students in the most appropriate and least restrictive settings. Major competencies included in Project PREM are listed, and the 10 program modules are outlined. The impact of Project PREM is also discussed. (SBH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

187
#9

ED157314

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Council for Exceptional Children

First World Congress

on Future Special Education

MEDIATING INTO THE MAINSTREAM

Stirling, Scotland

June 25-July 1, 1978

Donna Denney Haughton

Research Associate V

The University of Texas at Austin

Donna Denney Haughton
Research Associate V
EDB 210 - The University of Texas
at Austin
Austin, Texas 78712
USA

©

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

C.E.C.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

FC011799

INTRODUCTION

The College of Education at The University of Texas at Austin is committed to the continuous development of quality professional preparation at the preservice, inservice and predoctoral levels. In keeping with the priorities established by both national legislation (P.L. 94-142) and state legislation (HB1673), a new era has begun in the preparation of all educational personnel. The mandate to provide full service to the handicapped youth in the least restrictive environment appropriate with the educational needs of the student provides a challenge to all institutions preparing general educational personnel. It is evident that all educators must possess knowledge concerning and skills related to working with handicapped youth. The greater complexity in service delivery, as shown by the demand for interface of agencies, the variety of delivery systems, the various categories of handicapping conditions, the levels of severity for which public education will assume responsibility and the many new professional roles which have been created, have clearly established the need for all educators to possess competencies which have in the past been reserved for special educators.

During the past decade, both regular and special education have undergone a series of rapid changes in the areas of programming and delivery of services. Most conspicuous of these changes has been the trend to mainstream handicapped youth into regular educational programs. The Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975 (P.L. 94-142) declares that all states must establish procedures "to assure that, to the maximum extent appropriate, handicapped children, including children in public or private institutions or other care facilities, are educated with children who are not handicapped and that special classes, separate schooling, or other removal of handicapped children from the regular educational environment occurs only when the nature and severity of the handicap is such that education in regular classes with the use of supplementary aids and services cannot be achieved satisfactorily." The term mainstreaming will hereafter refer to the appropriate temporal, instructional, and social integration of handicapped youth with normal peers on the basis of an ongoing individual educational program and evaluation procedure. Although mainstreaming is public policy, the process of implementation will not be any easier. Other considerations are necessitated which include:

1. Placement of a child must be made on the basis of extensive evaluation of the educational needs of the child and carefully structured programs designed to meet those needs.
2. Clarification of the responsibilities of regular and special education administrative, instructional and supportive personnel must be completed along with the development of preparation models to provide general educational personnel with the competencies necessary to fulfill these responsibilities.

3. Research must be supported which will examine the impact and progress of mainstreaming programs as well as the implications for teacher preparation programs.

In 1975, the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped awarded 61 grants to institutions of higher education to establish training projects which would increase the competencies of regular educational personnel to accommodate a wider range of exceptionality in their classrooms and to provide individualized instruction. Project PREM (Preparing Regular Educators for Mainstreaming) was one of those projects with initial funding in June, 1975. The purpose of Project PREM has been to develop a training model and materials to prepare regular educational personnel to work with mildly handicapped students, to expand the implementation of the training model and to disseminate the revised materials within The University of Texas at Austin sphere of influence.

The project described in this three year proposal reflects the need for continued funding for assuring the integration of the training sequence into the professional preparation sequence, to expand the training influence beyond the limitations of the implementation of the ten modules, and to provide orientation and consultation for faculty who are currently involved in the teacher preparation program at The University of Texas at Austin.

EDUCATIONAL SIGNIFICANCE

This section provides background information concerning the implementation of legislation which encourages the placement of handicapped students in the most appropriate and least restrictive settings and the implications which can be drawn with respect to personnel preparation, inservice training programs, and the orientation of students to the various handicapping conditions with which they might come into contact.

BACKGROUND TO THE PROBLEM

Overview

During the past decade, both special education and regular education have been undergoing a series of rapid changes in the areas of programming and delivering services to handicapped students. Maynard Reynolds (O'Donnell and Bradfield, 1976) in reviewing the historical perspectives of providing services to the handicapped identifies four basic periods. The first is the period of the residential school. During the nineteenth century, full-time care was regarded as the most preferred arrangement for services. Residential centers for limited numbers of children were patterned after the model of the asylum in Europe. At the turn of the century, the community prototype period began with special classes and special schools being established in some of the larger

cities. The third period is by a surge of activity to launch programs on a broad scale to serve handicapped children in local schools. The number of children served in special classes in the public schools increased about 700 percent between 1945 and 1970. In about 1970, the fourth period began. Special education began negotiating for services in more integrated settings in the public schools and communities. Today the emphasis is placed upon providing services in as near a normal setting as can be beneficial to the student.

A number of factors have been responsible for providing impetus to the shift in thinking. Improved and more flexible systems for delivering services to students have been devised. These systems allow the handicapped student to benefit from placement in an educational setting based upon his/her current, identified educational needs. Instructional materials are available through local and/or regional material centers. Many of the more recently produced materials are dealing with these educational needs rather than merely providing a "watered down" curriculum (Birch, 1974).

Parents of handicapped students have responded to the needs of their children by exerting pressure on local and state boards of education and other legal entities. They have been successful in persuading legislation that mandates full service to all handicapped children. The judical and legislative imperatives including the right to education, least restrictive environment and due process are emerging as a result of actions of parent groups (O'Donnell and Bradfield, 1976).

When parents or parent groups faced failure in the legislative process, they turned to the courts for assistance in obtaining adequate services for their children. The decision rendered in the Pennsylvania Association for Retarded Children versus Commonwealth of Pennsylvania made it mandatory that free public education be made available to all mentally retarded students. The Mills v. Board of Education of the District of Columbia extended that decision to include all handicapped children. The Mills decision mandates that regular school assignments be given preference or alternatives be provided at public expense and that constitutionally adequate hearings be conducted prior to placement with reviews conducted periodically.

Other litigations have focused on the fairness and accuracy of psychological testing. As a result of the decisions of Hobson v. Hansen, Diana v. State Board of Education, Larry P. v. Riles, and Fred G. Wolf v. Utah, the following changes in the identification, assessment, and placement procedures are being enacted:

1. Educational placement of each child with any special needs will require due process procedures.
2. Programming patterns designed to meet the special needs of children will become more flexible and responsive.

3. The specific learning needs of children will determine the educational classification rather than reliance on psychological or medical classification systems.

4. Use of informal assessment techniques and of information collected from the home, school, and community will become more extensive as the reliance on standardized testing declines (Abeson, 1973).

The concept that the handicapped can only be educated through deviant environment and special programs and designs has been eliminated through decisions concerning still other litigations (Lake v. Cameron, McLaughlin v. Florida, and Loving v. Virginia). Thus, the adoption of policies and programs that promote the greatest degree of normalization has been emphasized.

The decisions have also contributed to the elimination of the concept that difference is by its nature threatening and the adoption of policies that honor and protect each individual's right to be different. In providing educational programming for handicapped children within the framework of the mainstream of education, the non-handicapped student is being given the opportunity to increase his/her appreciation of individual differences and broaden his/her level of acceptance of all differences be they racial, cultural, intellectual, physical or emotional.

In addition to the legislative and judicial mandates which have affected the delivery of educational services to handicapped students, the professional community has contributed to the re-structuring movement. During the past two decades, the appropriateness of special class placement for all handicapped children has been questioned. Efficacy studies have consistently failed to support the notion that all handicapped children can benefit more educationally, socially, and emotionally from placement in the more costly full-time special class than from placement in the educational mainstream (Bacher, 1965; Baldwin, 1958; Baller, 1936; Blatt, 1958; Carroll, 1967; Cassidy & Stanton, 1959; Diggs, 1964; Goldstein, Moss, & Jordan, 1965; Johnson and Kirk, 1950; Kern and Pfaeffle, 1962; Kirk, 1964; Mayer, 1966; Thurston, 1960).

In summary, the appropriateness of the self-contained special education class for all handicapped children has been questioned with the resulting implications being that greater numbers of mildly handicapped children will be receiving educational services in the context of regular educational programming. These decisions also imply the need for developing individual educational plans which would outline the child's program as well as provide a measure of accountability.

What exactly is mainstreaming? It most certainly is not a panacea for solving all the problems in both regular and special education. In fact, it will create many problems of its own. For regular educators it means extra work, broadening ranges of tolerance for behavioral and academic differences, and forming a working partnership with the field of special education. For special educators, it means watching exceptional learners struggle in a competitive, conformity-oriented educational setting where individualization of instruction and guaranteeing of success may be given limited emphasis. It also means trying to establish working partnerships with often less-than-enthusiastic regular teachers. For the exceptional learner, it means being less isolated, more stimulated, viewed as less special, and having appropriate language and behavioral models to emulate. But it also means being more vulnerable, more often subjected to stress, and somewhat more dependent on luck for placement with a teacher who is understanding, accepting, and knowledgeable.

So we trade off isolation, reliance on IQ scores, and stigmas from labeling for a more normal educational experience with a number of unknowns. It may never be possible to say that mainstreaming is good or bad on an unqualified basis, anymore than it was possible to say this about the self-contained special class. But we have extended the range of options available for providing better education for exceptional learners. We have not eliminated the need for self-contained classrooms or other traditional aspects of special education. But, hopefully, educational opportunity, guarantee of rights and best interests, and better education will become the rule in the future rather than the exception in the past, as has all too frequently been the case.

(F.M. Hewett with S.R. Forness. Education of Exceptional Learners. 2nd, Boston, Massachusetts: Allyn and Bacon, Inc. 1977, 592.)

Comprehensive Special Education in Texas

The State of Texas has provided leadership in the area of special education with the passage of Senate Bill 230 (1969) which mandates that new educational approaches be designed to meet the individual needs of handicapped children in all parts of Texas. The provision of comprehensive special education services included children ages three to twenty-one, children exhibiting a single impairment or any combination of impairments, and handicapped children living in any geographical location.

Prior to the passage of Senate Bill 230 and the resulting comprehensive special education plan entitled Plan A., the State supported a review of special education services which revealed the following information:

1. That less than 50% of all handicapped children were receiving services designed to meet their educational needs.
2. That approximately half of those receiving special education services were residing in only seven of the 254 counties in Texas while over 40 counties had no special services.

3. That program costs were too high.
4. That too many children with adequate educational potential were spending their lives in state institutions.
5. That too many handicapped children were dropping out of school (Management Services, 1968).

Plan A, designed to provide relief from these inadequacies, places emphasis for programming decisions to be made based on the educational need of the child. A continuum of services model with flexible instructional programming is provided. The amount and type of special education intervention is based upon the child's educational need. Emphasis was placed on providing as many of the needed services as possible within the mainstream of education or moving the handicapped child as quickly as possible into the regular classroom.

Project PRIME undertook the initial evaluation of Plan A during the 1972-73 school year with a statewide survey to assess the comprehensiveness and appropriateness of special education services. The following needs were identified as relative to the successful implementation of the Texas Plan A:

1. Eighty-six percent of the educational personnel surveyed indicated that the existing inservice programs met their needs only "somewhat" or "not at all."
2. Increased emphasis should be given to the development of human relations skills.
3. The implementation must involve all levels and be a systemic approach.

Three key areas of program development for training regular educators have also been identified:

1. The planning, development, and production of materials to meet the needs of a greatly varied population of students needs to be designed.
2. Delivery systems need to be developed to facilitate the implementation of newly developed materials and instructional techniques at the classroom, school, district, and regional levels.
3. Techniques for creating and extending an accepting atmosphere must be developed and implemented.

Statement of Need

Currently, 73% of the total identified handicapped students in Texas are being served in regular classes with resource and helping teacher assistance. Another 11% of the total are being served in part-time special classes and integrated into some regular but non-academic settings. These figures account for

approximately 259,508 of the 307,672 identified handicapped students in the state. As the number of identified handicapped students escalates to approximately 450,000 by 1980, so will the number of contact hours with regular classroom personnel. Therefore, the need for a well-organized concentrated effort to train the regular classroom teachers in the state to meet the educational needs of handicapped students is clearly evidenced. (See Appendix A.)

Traditionally, preservice and inservice education programs for regular classroom teachers have ignored the needs of handicapped students. Even when such programs are included, the stress seems to be placed on knowledge competencies which are seldom augmented by practica, address attitudinal concerns, or present specific strategies.

Placement of handicapped students in regular classrooms does not guarantee that they have moved into less restrictive educational environments as mandated by P.L. 94-142. The creation of the least restrictive environment in the regular classroom depends upon the development of an accepting atmosphere in which regular classroom teachers and peers display positive attitudes toward and interact positively with handicapped students.

Teacher-student and student-student interactions have a profound influence on student success. Teacher expectations have the potential to impede or facilitate student achievement and behavior (Beez, 1972; Rubin & Balow, 1971; Koegh and Becker, 1973; Adelman, 1970; Rothbart, Dalfen, & Barnett, 1971). Teacher attitudes serve as a model for peer acceptance or rejection. Peer acceptance of handicapped students may be a reflection of teacher attitude or may relate to personal attitudes and values derived from limited previous experiences (Gearheart, 1976). Peer acceptance in childhood is considered to be the most reliable predictor of adjustment in adulthood (Kohlberg, LaCrosse & Ricks, 1971).

Although teacher and peer interactions are important considerations for all children, they are crucial to the adjustment of handicapped children for whom interactions are often limited to stereotyped responses to the more obvious aspects of their handicaps.

The problems related to educating handicapped students in regular classrooms must be viewed as a systemic problem involving many components such as regular inservice and preservice teachers, school administrators, teacher education faculty, district-wide administrators/supervisors, parents and non-handicapped students. The interdependencies among these groups and in relation to special education personnel must be recognized and incorporated into a training program. The philosophy that no one group can be trained effectively in isolation from the others is an integral part of the program.

In responding to the outcries of parents of handicapped children who are being served in regular classes, the Texas Education Agency has amended Rule 226.62.03.010 concerning general requirements for teacher certification. Parents

and educators felt this move was necessary since the regular classroom is not less restrictive if teacher attitude and teaching practices segregate rather than integrate the handicapped student both in social and academic endeavors. The changes in certification regulations require that persons certified to teach have knowledge and skills relating to the education of exceptional/handicapped pupils. These required skills shall be incorporated into the framework of existing programs for elementary and secondary teachers. The specific changes read as follows:

To be certified to teach on the elementary level or secondary level, a person shall have knowledge and skills relating to the education of exceptional/handicapped pupils, incorporated within the framework of existing programs for elementary and secondary teachers, including:

(1) knowledge of the concept of least restrictive alternatives and its implications for the instructional process;
(2) knowledge of the characteristics and learning differences of exceptional/handicapped pupils;
(3) skills in informal assessment and a variety of instructional techniques and procedures for implementing the educational plan for exceptional/handicapped pupils; and
(4) knowledge of the admission, review, and dismissal processes and understanding of the individualized educational program for exceptional/handicapped pupils. (Texas Registrar, July 29, 1977.)

The training of those professionals responsible for meeting the needs of children in a mainstreamed setting necessitates a three-pronged approach: 1) preservice training; 2) inservice training; and 3) faculty orientation. The preservice training component encompasses both undergraduate students enrolled in elementary and secondary education programs and graduates enrolled in a post baccalaureate program in the College of Education. The inservice program would consist of training teachers, principals, and other administrative/leadership personnel, resource teachers, specialists, and instructional aides so that observation, practicum, and student teaching experiences would provide models for mainstreaming for preservice trainees. The faculty orientation component is comprised of consultation, resource, and workshop activities so that the exceptional/handicapped child component would be an integral part of the entire personnel preparation program.

The University of Texas at Austin graduates and recommends for provisional certification and endorsement approximately 1,500 students each year. There are 1,229 graduate students (Fall, 1976) enrolled in College of Education programs, some of whom are engaged in teaching undergraduate courses. Finally, the College of Education relies on approximately 200 instructional personnel to deliver the existing preparation program. The Austin Independent School District (AISD) provides students at The University of Texas at Austin with observation, practicum

and student teaching experiences. Figures relating to the numbers of professionals interacting at this level can be found in Appendix B along with the breakdown of university students seeking certification and/or endorsement.

Trainees and Their Roles

Project PREM (Preparing Regular Educators for Mainstreaming) was initially funded in June 1975, to develop a competency-guided program to prepare regular educators at the preservice level and at the inservice level to meet the needs of exceptional children within the regular classroom setting. Continuation funding for 1976-77 was devoted to support the initial implementation of the program. The funding for the third year of the Project was utilized for the integration of the program into existing courses and inservice plans and for the revision of material and methods based upon the field test data.

Recognizing the interdependencies among the groups exerting influence on both teacher preparation programs and successful mainstreaming, Project PREM has incorporated regular and special education inservice teachers, preservice teachers, school administrators, teacher education faculty, and parents of handicapped children into the planning, implementation, and evaluation phases of the training experiences. Project graduates in each of these roles will be performing jobs which will facilitate the successful integration of the handicapped student into the mainstream of education.

During the pilot testing phase of the Project, the Planning & Development Team supervised a group of forty-six preservice elementary education majors, a group of forty-three preservice secondary education majors, and a group of eighteen inservice teachers, both elementary and secondary, as they progressed through modules dealing with the topic of mainstreaming. Additional groups of preservice teacher education majors and graduate students had the opportunity to field test Project materials. These groups included: a junior level observation block; a graduate level class in parent counseling; one hundred fifty elementary and secondary education student teachers. Continued efforts have been made to provide training in connection with a new teacher orientation workshop sponsored by the Austin Independent School District and an administrators workshop also sponsored by Austin Independent School District.

During the 1976-77 academic year approximately one hundred fifty preservice elementary and secondary teachers cycled through the modules in the Educators' Laboratory. The faculty in the College of Education at The University of Texas at Austin have been surveyed to determine areas of concern related to teacher preparation. Their questions and interests were used as a basis to form two panels for the Forum on Mainstreaming which was co-sponsored by Project PREM and the Department of Special Education.

In conjunction with the efforts in the area of continuing education and community awareness, Project PREM became involved in preparing a 26-minute radio program dealing with the issues of mainstreaming. Costs for the production and airing of the program will be absorbed by the University.

During the third year of the Project funding, the number of participants in the training component will include a minimum of 300 new preservice teachers, 100 new inservice teachers, and an additional 20 administrators/supervisors. In an attempt to provide continuity to the faculty awareness component, the Planning and Development Team will sponsor a series of workshops related to mainstreaming and increasing teacher effectiveness.

Competencies

The major areas of need were identified during the initial year of funding utilizing input from the various forces involved in the education of the handicapped child. These forces included regular elementary and secondary teachers, both preservice and inservice, administrators/supervisors, university personnel, and parents of handicapped children. The information obtained from the survey of these groups was then compiled with the needs as expressed in the current literature. The following areas were identified as specific instructional domains to be included in the competency-based program to be developed by Project PREM:

1. Rationale of mainstreaming
2. Clarification of values related to mainstreaming
3. Educational philosophy related to mainstreaming
4. Self-concept development
5. Characteristics and implications of handicapping conditions
6. Labeling dysfunction
7. Materials information
8. Team relationships
9. Personnel utilization
10. Behavior management skill
11. Environmental arrangement

12. Time utilization

13. Parental involvement

14. Community utilization

15. Diagnostic competencies

16. Curriculum employment

17. Career education adaptations

Modules

A series of ten (10) modules were subsequently developed and field tested at The University of Texas at Austin. Specifically, the modules are designed to deal with teacher attitudes, an understanding of mainstreaming, an overview of handicapping conditions, individualized instruction, materials, behavior management, career education, tests and observation, integration, and communication skills. The regular classroom teacher who progresses through these modules will have a better understanding of his/her role in the mainstreaming process and will, therefore, facilitate the successful integration of mildly handicapped children into the regular classroom. The following is a brief description of the goals and objectives of each of these modules:

LETS 001.00 LET'S TRY ON A LEARNING PROBLEM
GOAL: To develop an accepting and understand attitude toward the handicapped student in the regular classroom.
OBJECTIVES:

1. To state his/her values in relation to mainstreaming;
2. To experience the sensations of failure and of being different;
3. To identify the personality and physical differences which tend to isolate people;
4. To identify positive characteristics of student's behavior.

LETS 002.00 LET'S GET IT ON: MAINSTREAMING AND PLAN A
GOAL: To develop an understanding of the concepts, rationale, interests, and concerns for mainstreaming in general and Plan A specifically.
OBJECTIVES:

1. To prepare a definition of mainstreaming;
2. To compare and contrast the major factors of mainstream education with those of traditional special education;
3. To develop an understanding of the legislative components of Plan A;
4. To understand the roles of the supportive personnel of Plan A.

LETS 003.00 LET'S MEET WHO WE ARE TALKING ABOUT: OVERVIEW OF HANDICAPPING CONDITIONS

GOAL: To develop an understanding of impairments which could interfere with some aspects of learning and an understanding of techniques for creating an environment which will facilitate successful learning experiences for all students.

OBJECTIVES:

1. To demonstrate an understanding of Special Education terminology in relation to instructional procedures;
2. To identify the strengths of students who have impairments;
3. To identify behavioral commonalities as related to handicapped and normal students;
4. To identify factors within the student and the environment which might interfere with the successful completion of a learning task;
5. To identify four journal articles which have implications for developing and maintaining the successful learning environment in the regular classroom.

LETS 004.00 LET'S INDIVIDUALIZE: ALTERNATIVE INSTRUCTIONAL STRATEGIES

GOAL: To develop an understanding of the basic concepts for individualizing instruction.

OBJECTIVES:

1. To determine if a class is individualized and identify factors which may contribute to or prevent individualized instruction;
2. To identify basic components of alternative instructional strategies;
3. To identify and assess learning styles which relate to the different sensory modalities, strengths, and weaknesses;
4. To develop a method, lesson, or strategy for expanding the learning environment beyond the classroom.

LETS 005.00 LET'S HURRY UP AND LISTEN

GOAL: To develop strategies for facilitating interaction among all persons involved in the mainstreaming of exceptional students.

OBJECTIVES:

1. To identify "roadblocks" and "freeways" to communication;
2. To use communication skills to initiate interaction between the regular classroom teacher and Plan A personnel;
3. To identify service areas outside the school which can aid in meeting the needs of handicapped students;
4. To identify methods of utilizing various instructional/ personnel arrangements in a mainstreaming program;
5. To identify methods of initiating teacher-parent interaction;
6. To identify four topics which could be used to enhance community involvement in the educational process;
7. To identify strategies which will facilitate communications between regular and special educators.

LETS 006.00 LET'S GET IT TOGETHER: INTEGRATION

GOAL: To develop skills to facilitate the successful social and academic integration of the handicapped student into the regular classroom.

OBJECTIVES:

1. To identify possible underlying reasons for rejection/isolation in the classroom;
2. To identify three methods for building self-concept;
3. To demonstrate skill in using and interpreting classroom interaction information;
4. To develop and implement a plan for facilitating integration for a mainstreamed student.

LETS 007.00 LET'S SPARE THE ROD: CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT

GOAL: To develop strategies for managing student behavior in order to facilitate learning.

OBJECTIVES:

1. To demonstrate understanding of terminology associated with behavior management methods/theories;
2. To demonstrate the ability to initiate preventive measures for behavior problems;
3. To demonstrate the ability to cope with inappropriate behavior by describing feasible solutions for given situations.

LETS 008.00 LET'S LOOK AND SEE: TESTS AND OBSERVATION

GOAL: To develop an understanding of the participant's role in the evaluation process, appraisal techniques utilized in the assessment of exceptional students and utilization of evaluation data to make educational decisions for special students.

OBJECTIVES:

1. To identify areas of consideration used to assess student strengths and weaknesses;
2. To identify types of evaluation data available on handicapped students;
3. To analyze information gathered formally and/or informally in the regular classroom;
4. To understand their role in the utilization of evaluation data to make educational decisions for the handicapped student.

LETS 009.00 LET'S MATERIALIZE

GOAL: To develop skill in adapting, preparing, and utilizing appropriate materials and media for the instruction of handicapped students in the regular classroom.

OBJECTIVES:

1. To preview and evaluate the usefulness of multimedia kits of instructional materials to integrate handicapped learners into the regular classroom;
2. To design an individualized learning approach for mastery of a skill or concept in his/her area of concentration;

3. To construct an individual lesson plan for a given student consisting of five consecutive ten to fifteen minute lessons;
4. To identify teaching and learning styles which may be used as resources in planning instructional strategies.

LETS 010.00 LET'S LOOK TO THEIR FUTURE: CAREER EDUCATION

GOAL: To develop a diversity of techniques, processes, and materials to meet the needs of the handicapped student in the career education program.

OBJECTIVES:

1. To identify skills for successful introduction into the world of work;
2. To design a lesson plan for the employment of a vocationally oriented resource; and
3. To identify potential job placement for a student within his/her particular area of interest.

The ten (10) LET'S Series Modules were developed to provide a general orientation and develop more general skills and competencies of both elementary and secondary preservice and inservice teachers. Participants in the initial piloting of the modules expressed a desire for the Project to provide a continuation of services by developing additional modules which would be more subject and student age related. Therefore, Project PREM has begun planning for the development of an additional series of modules designed to familiarize teachers with materials and techniques for teaching specific subject matter to students within a more limited age span. The planning includes developing avenues of communication to become a resource or serve as a consultant to those faculty who are engaged in teaching the methods courses. It is anticipated that the exceptional/handicapped child component will, therefore, become an integral part of each course.

Project Impact

The impact of Project PREM on the College of Education and on the community can be witnessed from the following areas of involvement:

1. The Project Newsletter
2. The Forum on Mainstreaming
3. Handbook for university faculty and public school administrators
4. Provision of training in pre-existing courses
5. Involvement with the Teacher Corps Project
6. Provision for inservice training
7. Follow-up on project participants
8. Provision of guidance and materials for other BEH funded Dean's Projects
9. Multi-disciplinary Advisory Committee

During the initial year of the Project a newsletter entitled The PREMER was developed to provide the staff with a means to maintain contact and interaction with the Advisory Committee. The circulation of the newletter during the second year was expanded to include monthly issues being sent to all faculty in the College of Education, all administrative personnel in the local and state education agencies, school board members, other Dean's projects, and other interested persons including parents of handicapped children. During the third year of the Project the newsletter is continuing to expand its circulation and has come to address some of the key issues and concerns about mainstreaming which are being expressed within the College of Education at The University of Texas at Austin and within the community.

The College of Education, in conjunction with the Department of Special Education and Project PREM, prepared a forum to address the issues of mainstreaming during Year II of the Project. Forum speakers included Dr. John Kidd and Dr. Evelyn Deno. Presentations from each speaker were followed by a panel discussion in which questions were directed to both Dr. Deno and Dr. Kidd. The panel was composed of various representatives of the different departments within the College of Education, as well as persons representing other aspects of education in Texas.

As a follow-up to the forum activities, a handbook for faculty members and school administrators is being compiled. This handbook will contain a summary of the forum activities as well as responses to questions which have been expressed by the faculty and by public school administrators.

To provide continuity to these initial efforts of faculty orientation, the Project Staff will begin working with the Center for Teaching Effectiveness in conducting a series of faculty workshops dealing with matters related to accommodating the handicapped student at The University of Texas at Austin. The seminars will consist of a series of three hour and a half to two hour workshops dealing with the concepts of individual differences in learning styles and rates, attitudes toward individuals exhibiting variations, and methods of making university courses more accommodating to those individual differences. Portions of the competency-based modules which have been developed to train preservice and in-service elementary and secondary teachers will be adapted to serve as a guide for these seminars.

To date, the Project has provided training in the junior level courses entitled Psychological Foundations for the Elementary School and Psychological Foundations for Secondary Education. The first four modules have been field tested and subsequently incorporated in these introductory courses for education majors. The remaining six modules will become incorporated into other courses in the professional preparation sequence for education majors. During the first year, the Project also provided input into the Teacher Corps proposal for the 11th Cycle. Teacher Corps graduate and undergraduate interns have cycled through

the series of ten modules as part of their training. The modules have been fully incorporated in the instructional program for interns, teachers, teacher aides, and other instructional personnel in Allison Elementary and the satellite schools of the 11th Cycle Teacher Corps program. It is proposed that during the third year continued emphasis be given to the identification of competencies in pre-existing classes to specify areas of common concern and to clarify procedures for the complete incorporation of the project materials. Involvement with the Teacher Corps program will be continued in an attempt to provide training to all educational personnel in the target schools at both the preservice and the in-service levels.

A group of 18 inservice teachers, both elementary and secondary, participated in the pilot testing of the modules during the initial year of the Project. Continued inservice training activities are being planned with the Austin Independent School District and in coordination with the Texas Education Agency and the Regional Service Centers for additional areas. Training workshops will be sponsored to familiarize teachers, supervisors, administrators, and inservice training directors with the work of the Project and with the skills for providing training using the modular concept.

Each participant in the training for mainstreaming is being asked to complete a card for the permanent records of the Project. In this way, the Project Staff will find it possible to complete an annual follow-up study on those who have completed the training. This information will be useful in both the formative and the summative evaluations.

The impact of the proposed Project PREM on the College of Education and on the community will be witnessed from the following areas of involvement:

1. The Project Newsletter
2. College-wide seminars and workshops
3. Provision for training in pre-existing courses
4. Information packets for faculty
5. Provision for inservice training
6. Provision of guidance and materials for other BEH funded projects and for preservice training institutions which do not have a Dean's Project
7. Development of training materials in specific subject areas
8. Provision for curriculum materials for preservice trainees
9. Follow-up on project participants

The project newsletter The PREMER will continue to provide the staff with a means of maintaining contact and interaction with the Advisory Committee, the newly established Curriculum Committee, faculty within the College of Education, local and state education agencies, other Dean's projects, and other

interested persons including parents of handicapped children. Two issues per year will be devoted to regional activities and serve to communicate the progress of each project to its goals.

College-wide seminars and workshops will be held on a weekly basis to address topics of concern related by the Curriculum Committee. Six workshops each year of the proposed project will feature well-known guest lecturers who will also serve as a consultant to the project for that day. It is anticipated that these seminars and workshops will be attended by faculty, both graduate and undergraduate students, representatives of the state and local education agencies, and other interested persons from the community. Video tapes will be made of the 18 special sessions for future reference.

The project staff will continue to implement the ten training modules in the pre-existing courses as well as develop additional modules and training materials for the professional sequence. The Curriculum Committee will assist the staff in the identification of needs, the development and implementation of the materials, and the program evaluation.

Information packets will be developed for distribution to the faculty and to inservice teachers on topical concerns. The concerns will be identified through the initial needs assessment and through continual interaction with the Curriculum Committee.

The inservice training component will be a vital link to the preservice training component. Educators including teachers, administrators, supervisors, counselors, and instructional aides will receive training to work with handicapped students not only to facilitate their efforts in the classroom but also to provide exemplary settings for observations, practica, and student teaching experiences of students from The University of Texas at Austin. Following initial district-wide training sessions, those trainees will serve as local liaisons with the project. Their function will be to assist the Project PREM staff with needs assessment, training, and evaluation activities.

Project PREM assumed a leadership role in providing guidance, materials and coordination to other BEH funded Dean's Projects and to other preservice training institutions which do not have a Dean's Project during the first funding phase. It will retain this role by providing coordination of the Deans' Projects in the South Central Region, by disseminating materials and replicating the model in other areas, and by co-sponsoring a graduate/post-graduate level course to prepare college and university faculty to include exceptional/handicapped child component in coursework and to accommodate the handicapped student in the college setting.

Project PREM will continue to develop training materials such as modules, audiotapes, videotapes, programmed texts, and booklets to prepare regular educators to meet the needs of handicapped students and to facilitate the inclusion of the exceptional/handicapped child component within existing courses. Information packets which have already been identified as relevant include: 1) informal assessment techniques; 2) developing individualized education programs (I.E.P.); 3) elementary and secondary programming; and 4) individualizing instruction.

As a result of the move of the Area Learning Resouce Center, students at The University of Texas at Austin may experience difficulty in obtaining curriculum materials which are used with handicapped students. Project PREM will provide a consultant service to various departments in the College in terms of purchasing materials for their curriculum libraries. Additional curriculum materials will be purchased and housed in the Project offices.

Funding for Project PREM will facilitate the continuous follow-up on participants in the training sessions. Staff will use this information to create both formative and summative evaluations. On-going program modifications will be based on the participant follow-up questionnaires.

Project PREM will have influence on the training of approximately 1,500 preservice students each year. Faculty orientation will involve approximately 200 instructional personnel. The inservice component will begin by working with approximately two key personnel from each of the 80 schools in the Austin Independent School District. They, in turn, will assist in the training of the remaining teachers, administrators, supervisors, counselors, and instructional aides. Project PREM will work with the Office of Staff Development and Student Teaching in designing a program which would insure the continuous upgrading of skills for working with handicapped students in regular classrooms.

In an attempt to assess the contribution of project graduates, the Project Staff will maintain files on all trainees and will request that they complete a questionnaire on their competency in meeting the needs of handicapped students. Program graduates will be asked to allow a questionnaire to be sent to their employer which would relate to mainstreaming competencies. During the course of the Project consenting inservice trainees will be observed for effectiveness in mainstreaming utilizing the inventory found in Appendix C.

REFERENCES

Abeson, A. (Ed.). A Continuing Summary of Pending and Completed Litigation Regarding the Education of Handicapped Children. Arlington, Virginia: The Council for Exceptional Children's State-Federal Information Clearinghouse for Exceptional Children, 1973, 1-5.

Adelman, H. An interactional view of causality. Academic therapy, 1970, 6, 43-52.

Bacher, J. The effects of special class placement on the self-concept, social adjustment, and reading growth of slow learners. Dissertation Abstracts, 1965, 25, 70-71

Baldwin, W. The social position of the educable mentally retarded child in the regular grades in the public school. Exceptional Children, 1958, 25, 106-108.

Baller, W. A study of the present social status of a group of adults, who when they were in elementary schools were classified as mentally deficient. Genetic Psychology Monographs, 1936, 18, 165-244.

Beez, W.V. Influence of biased psychological reports on teacher behavior and pupil performance. In Morrison, A. and McIntyre, D. (Eds.) The social psychology of teaching. Baltimore, Md.: Penguin Books, Inc., 1972.

Birch, J.W. Mainstreaming: Educable mentally retarded children in regular classes. Minneapolis, Minnesota: Leadership Training Institute/Special Education, University of Minnesota, 1974.

BFA Educational Media, What is a handicap? series. Santa Monica, California: CBS, Inc., 1975.

Blatt, B. The physical, personality, and academic status of children who are mentally retarded attending special classes as compared with children who are mentally retarded attending regular classes. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 1958, 62, 801-818.

Carroll, W. The effects of segregated and partially integrated school programs on self-concept and academic achievement of educable mentally retarded. Exceptional Children, 1967, 84, 93-96.

Cassidy, V.M., and Stanton, J.E. An investigation of factors involved in the educational placement of mentally retarded children: A study of differences between children in special and regular classes in Ohio. Cooperative Research Project No. 043. Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University, 1959.

Chesler, B. A walk in another pair of shoes. Los Angeles, Calif: CANHC, 1972.

Collins, W.A. Aspects of television content and children's special behavior. Final report, July, 1974, University of Minnesota Grant No. OCD-CB-477. Office of Child Development, Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

Cruickshank, W. The false hope of integration. The Australian Journal on the Education of Backward Children, 21(2), July 1974, 70-72.

Dale, E. Audio visual methods in teaching. (3rd Ed.) New York: The Dryden Press, Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc., 1969.

Dewey, J. Introduction to the use of resources in education. In E.R. Clapp, The use of resources in education. New York: Harper & Row, 1952.

Diggs, E. A study of change in the social status of rejected mentally retarded children in regular classrooms. Dissertation Abstracts, 1965, 25, 220-221.

Erickson, C.W. & Curl, D.H. Fundamentals of teaching with audiovisual technology. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1972.

Flavell, J. The development of role-taking and communication skills in children. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1968.

Flavell, J. The developmental psychology of Jean Piaget. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1963.

Gearheart, B.R. & Weishahn, M.W. The handicapped child in the regular classroom. St. Louis: The C.V. Mosby Company, 1976.

Goldstein, H., Moss, J.W. & Jordan, L.F. The efficacy of special class training on the development of mentally retarded children. Cooperative Research Project No. 619. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education, 1965.

Halloran, J.D. Attitude formation and change. Leicester, Leicester University Press (Television Research Committee Working Paper No. 2), 1967.

Johnson, G., & Kirk, S. Are mentally handicapped children segregated in the regular grades? Exceptional Child, 1950, 17, 65-68.

Keogh, B. & Becker, L. Early detections of learning problems: Questions, cautions, and guidelines. Exceptional children, 1973, 40, 5-11.

Kern, W. & Pfaeffle, H. A comparison of social adjustment of mentally retarded children in various educational settings. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 1962, 67, 407-413.

Kirk, S.A. Research in education. In H.A. Stevens & R. Heber (Eds.), Mental retardation: A review of research. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964, 57-99.

Kohlberg, L., LaCrosse, J., & Ricks, D. The predictability of adult mental health from childhood behavior. In B. Wolman (Ed.) Handbook of child psychopathology. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.

Lazar, A. Unpublished Scale. Attitude toward handicapped individuals (ATHI). Department of Educational Psychology, California State University, Long Beach, 1973.

Leifer, A.D., Gordon, N.J. & Graves, S.B. Children's television: More than mere entertainment. Howard Educational Review, 1974, 44, 213-245.

Liebert, R.M. & Poulos, R.S. Television as moral teachers. In T. Lickona (Ed.) Man and morality: Theory, research and social issues. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1974.

Mann, P.H. (Ed.) Shared responsibility for handicapped students: Advocacy and programming. Coral Gables, Florida: University of Miami Training and Technical Assistance Center, 1976.

Mayer, L. The relationship of early special class placement and the self-concept of mentally handicapped children. Exceptional Children, 1966, 33, 77-80.

O'Donnell, P.A. & Bradfield, R.H. (Ed.) Mainstreaming: Controversy and consensus. San Rafael, California: Academic Therapy Publications, 1976.

Osgood, E.C., Suci, G.J. & Tannebaum, P. The measurement of meaning. Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1957.

Poulos, R.W. Television's prosocial effects: A positive look at the medium. Journal of Social Issues, In G. Comstock (Ed.) Television and human behavior: The key studies. Santa Monica, California: Rand, 1975.

Project PREM. Let's get it together: Integration. Module Lets 006.00. Austin, Texas: The University of Texas, 1976.

Provision of instruction to handicapped pupils in local public schools. NCES, Spring 1970, 8 and U.S. Senate Report No. 94-168, Education for All Handicapped Children Act. June 2, 1975, 56.

Rothbart, M., Dalfen, S.S. & Barnett, R. Effects of a teacher's expectancy on student-teacher interaction. Journal of Educational Psychology. 1972, 62 (1), 49-54.

Rubenstein, E.A., Leibert, R.M., Neale, J.M., & Poulos, R.W. Assessing television's influence on children's prosocial behavior. Stony Brook, N.Y.: Brookdale International Institute, 1974 (Occasional paper 74-11).

Rubin, R., & Balow, B. Learning and behavior disorders: A longitudinal study. Exceptional Children. 1971, 38, 293-298.

Rucker, C.N., & Gable, R. Rucker-Gable Educational Programming Scale. Storrs, Conn.: Rucker-Gable Associates, 1973.

Special feature: Mainstreaming. Today's Education, March/April 1976, 18.

Spinello, B. A day in the life of Bonnie Consolo. Pasadena, California: Arthur Barr Productions, 1975.

Sprafkin, J.N., Liebert, R.M. & Poulos, R.W. Effects of a prosocial televised example on children's helping. Journal of Experimental Child Psychology. In G. Comstock (Ed.) Television and human behavior: The key studies. Santa Monica, California: Rand, 1975.

Stevenfeldt Educational Films, Blindness...It's no big deal. San Francisco, California: Author.

Thurstone, Thelma G. An evaluation of educating mentally handicapped children in special classes and in regular grades. (U.S. Office of Education Cooperative Research Program, Project No. OE-SAE-6452) Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, 1960.

Wade, G.S. The development and pilot testing of an inventory to assess teacher anxiety regarding mainstreaming. Unpublished master's report, The University of Texas at Austin, 1976.

Zigler, E. Education Daily, March 22, 1976, 4.